DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 688 UD 007 285

Report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.
National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 31 Mar 66
Note-35p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.85
Descriptors-*Annual Reports, Compensatory Education Programs, Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Legislation, Federal Aid, *Federal Laws, *Federal Programs, Program Administration, *Program Evaluation, Program Improvement, State Agencies
Identifiers-Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I

This document is the first annual report of the Advisory Council on the operation and administration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I. Discussed are the implementation of the act, the projects which are enabled by grants under the act, and problem areas. An evaluation section notes that it was too soon to obtain evidence of results but it was apparent that evaluation would be difficult. The council makes 10 recommendations for improvement on the Federal, state, and local levels. (NH)

ED030688

07285 E

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

WASHINGTON, D.C.

O. MEREDITH WILSON
President
University of Minnesota
Chairman

LOUIS BRUNO
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Washington

JOHN H. FISCHER
President
Teachers College, Columbia University

EDWARD B. HANIFY
Ropes, Gray, Best, Coolidge & Rugg
Boston, Massachusetts

FRANK E. KARELSEN
Karelsen & Karelsen
New York, New York

ELIZABETH D. KOONTZ
President
Department of Classroom Teachers
National Education Association

MILDRED L. LILLIE
Justice
District Court of Appeal
Los Angeles, California

SIDNEY P. MARLAND Jr.
Superintendent of Schools
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

VICTOR G. REUTHER
Director of Education Programs
United Auto Workers

JOSEPH ROSEN
Principal
Howland Elementary School
Chicago, Illinois

THE HONORABLE TERRY SANFORD
Raleigh, North Carolina

RALPH W. TYLER
Director
Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences
Stanford, California

THOMAS W. CARR
Staff Director
Washington, D.C.

March 31, 1966

The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear President Johnson:

I have the honor to transmit to you the first annual report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children concerning the administration and operation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

In the preparation of this report the Council has received full cooperation from the Office of Education, and is grateful for the courteous and sympathetic service provided by the Commissioners and their staff. It has also had wise and energetic help from its own staff. The observations, conclusions, and recommendations of this report are the responsibility of the Council alone. Its members have maintained independence and impartiality in their study of the federal-state-local efforts to meet the needs of the educationally disadvantaged. The Council members are prepared to discuss their findings and recommendations with the White House staff, the Congress, and other interested parties, as you may direct them.

Sincerely,

O. Meredith Wilson

O. Meredith Wilson
Chairman

Enclosure

UD 007 285

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

March 31, 1966

		Page
I	PREAMBLE	1
II	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACT	4
III	DISCUSSION OF PROJECTS	6
	Introduction	6
	Major Thrust--Language Skills in Early Years	7
	Curriculum	11
	Teacher Aides	12
	Health, Food, and Clothing	13
	Counseling	14
	Libraries	15
	Equipment	16
IV	PROBLEM AREAS	17
	Introduction	17
	Reaching the Children	17
	Lack of Personnel	18
	Quality Control	19
	Relationship Between Public Schools and Private and Parochial Schools	20
	Coordination of Title I with the Federal Anti-Poverty Program	22
	The Poorest Counties	23
	Federal Control	23
V	EVALUATION	25
VI	RECOMMENDATIONS	28
VII	CONCLUSION	31

UD 007 285

I PREAMBLE

The subject of Public Law 89-10 is children--in particular, disadvantaged children, of whom there may be as many as 15 million in the United States. For the first time "disadvantaged" is defined by an Act of Congress--an Act which is an essential measure in the Nation's War on Poverty.

The low levels of education associated with a low economic state suggest a high correlation between educational disadvantage and the inability of the poor to break out of the cycle of regenerating poverty. In the opinion of this Council, unless the children of our land can be freed from the chains of disadvantage which bind them to a life of hopelessness and misery, battles may be won in the War on Poverty, but final defeat will be inevitable. Legislation that does not recognize this essential will be merely an opiate, temporarily making life more bearable but in no way infusing it with the hope for the future that should be the birthright of free men.

The educational disadvantages these children have suffered have been severe. They have not lived in a world of books, or of ideas. Even the simplest examples in children's texts often do not fall within their experience. In consequence, they have not understood concepts in tests devised for the majority of the children of our schools. At one time we considered such tests a valid measure of intelligence, so we branded those who did poorly on them as having little potential for learning. Their presumed

incapacity led us to neglect them further, or to teach them manual skills only, thus perpetuating the cycle of poverty-ignorance, ignorance-poverty. Our failure to educate these children helped to make a fact of our pre-judgment of "little potential." Research on these learning problems shows that the tests have measured the results of the child's opportunity for learning more accurately than his capacity for present or future learning. Some psychologists now assert that the ability of our children to learn, whatever the limitation of their environment, is limited only by our skill as educators.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has, for the first time, made available major resources to bring opportunity to those who until now have lacked even hope. It has directed the attention of educators toward the plight of the disadvantaged. It has provided to local boards of education the funds necessary to develop programs through which children can overcome the handicapping limitations of poverty-ridden environments. The record of response is already good. With more time to plan their campaigns, the States can be expected to do increasingly better. But it is important to keep the purpose of Title I in sharp focus. Solving the problems of the disadvantaged will require the best inventive efforts of public officials in all the States. Initial efforts which are not immediately successful may cause some to turn aside to well-trodden roads where the going is easier. Work with the gifted is likely to be more

exciting and seem more rewarding and to receive more applause or appreciation from the citizens of substance on whom we draw for our Boards of Education. Better education for the average student is a goal that is likely to have appeal, for it can be more easily reached. Unless we focus on the disadvantaged, habit and ease may lead to diverting funds to more conventional objectives. The efforts of Title I, therefore, should not be merged at this time with general aid for schools.

Title I firmly directs the attention of the Commissioner of Education and the State and local systems of education toward disadvantaged children. As far as possible, it should follow those children wherever they may be found--in public or in private schools. But in the administration of the Title, it is important to insist that its objective is to help children, not institutions.

Educationally disadvantaged children are distributed widely. They may be found in public schools, and in private or parochial schools; they may be found in Appalachia, and they may be found in small pockets or enclaves in wealthy communities. Wherever they may be, it is the purpose of Title I to support programs designed to lift these particular handicapped into the world of books and ideas; to make possible their fuller participation in the greater society; and, where possible, to give to each of them hope and the internal resource that education alone can provide. It is on these children and their needs, and not on institutions, that the resources of this legislation should be concentrated.

II IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACT

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act went into effect April 11, 1965, and on September 23 appropriations were made available to the States. Since that time, thousands of school systems have begun to implement the new programs authorized by this landmark legislation.

Title I provides for State approval of local judgments of the most pressing educational needs of children of low-income families. The Office of Education acted quickly following enactment to assist States in implementing the new law. Regional and local conferences supplemented written instructions, and no effort was spared to build an effective Federal-State-local partnership equipped to achieve the objectives of the Act.

Over 97% of the Nation's 25,000 school districts are eligible for support under Title I, and by March 18, 11,500 had one or more Title I projects approved. A total of $757 million has already been obligated for 13,503 projects, benefiting perhaps 5.6 million children. The Office of Education estimates that as many as 7 million educationally handicapped children may receive Title I benefits during 1966.1/ But because large-scale implementation of the Act did not begin until the middle of the school year, this report will focus more on plans and trends than on concrete results.

1/See Table I

TABLE I

DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN REACHED BY TITLE I

Universe of Educationally Disadvantaged Children2/	15 million
Children from families with income under $3000	8.1 million
Children participating in Title I Projects3/	7 million
Children in Title I allocation base (Family income under $2000 or AFDC)	5.5 million

2/Educationally disadvantaged children are those whose educational achievement is substantially below that normally expected of children of their age and grade.

3/Exceeds allocation base because some children in Title I school attendence areas are from families earning more than $2000.

III DISCUSSION OF PROJECTS

Introduction.

Although the majority of sample projects studied contain little new to the total American education experience, they are often new to the school system implementing them, and totally new to the underprivileged children involved. According to our study of 484 projects, two-thirds of this year's Title I funds are being spent for "new", as contrasted with "continued" services. These special programs range from kindergartens for children of the poor enrolled in school systems which were never able to afford these classes, to new work-study programs for mentally retarded high-schoolers.

It is clear from the record, however, that the principal target of local programs is the young child, from three to twelve years old. Seventy percent of the children affected by Title I funds are in pre-primary classes through grade six. By far the largest area of emphasis of these programs is a new and fresh concentration on the language arts--reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Also new to many elementary schools are teacher aides and other auxiliary personnel.

Title I funds are providing food and clothing and a variety of health services for deprived children. For many small, rural school systems in this country, this is something entirely new, although they have recognized the need for many years.

Counseling, once restricted to secondary schools, is now becoming an accepted part of the elementary program.

With Title I money, school systems have put libraries in schools that serve poor neighborhoods, and are stocking them not only with books, but with up-to-date audio-visual equipment.

Another new trend is the expansion of the school day, week, and year. Educators, long aware that this additional time can be used to reinforce classroom learning, have found special applicability of voluntary after-school hours, Saturday mornings, and summer programs for the educationally backward. After-school study centers, Saturday morning classes, and a host of innovative summer programs, have added considerable momentum to this trend in American education.4/

Major Thrust--Language Skills in Early Years.

There is much to be learned about the problems of the disadvantaged in the school setting , but the major weakness that undermines their educational achievement lies in the general area of language arts. School administrators have recognized this, and 75% of the sample projects studied included provisions for special remedial work in reading, speaking, or writing.

Special reading and language courses are urgently needed by children of deprivation because the new words they must learn

4/See Table II

TABLE II

484 SAMPLE PROJECTS

Time Conducted	No.	%
Projects during the regular school day	438	88
Projects before and/or after school	59	12
Projects during the weekend	25	5
Projects during the summer	199	40

(Note: Many regular school day projects are also held on the weekends, during the summer, etc. Hence, projects total more than 484.)

describe differences among things, shapes, colors, and simple concepts to which their limited experiences have not made them sensitive. There is little question that language is the basic tool of all learning. Without language skills as a foundation, later schooling soon falters. This principle has received emphasis not only in Title I programs, but also in the educational aspects of Project Head Start, administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, which attempts to aid the development of underprivileged children by improving their ability to think, reason, and speak clearly.

During fiscal year 1966, the Federal Government will invest about $170 million to improve the language skills of almost one million deprived children who are not yet in primary schools: 476,000 children in Title I projects ($64 million), and 500,000 children in Project Head Start ($106 million).5/ An additional four million primary school children will receive language skills instruction under Title I ($430 million).

Next year, most of the 1.8 million pre-primary children (ages 4-5) whose families have annual incomes of less than $2,000 should be reached by either Title I or Head Start. The total cost will be close to $400 million--but the Council is convinced that using this money to improve the language skills of these unfortunate youngsters is as wise an educational investment as this Nation can make.

5/See Table III

TABLE III

LANGUAGE SKILLS TRAINING FOR DISADVANTAGED
PRE-PRIMARY CHILDREN (AGES 4-5)

FY 1966
(000 Omitted)

Title I6/		476
Head Start6/		500
Disadvantaged Pre-Primary Children (Not now enrolled in school)		1,800

6/Includes children in projects sponsored jointly by Title I and OEO. (An undetermined number of children participate in both Title I and Head Start projects.)

Curriculum.

Title I has focused increasing attention upon the failure of most existing curricula to meet the needs of disadvantaged children, and has encouraged a number of curriculum revision projects. About 70% of these projects, however, proposed to introduce "special" courses. While these courses may be necessary as initial or interim steps, they cannot be viewed as a sufficient response to the problem. Many of them are short-term plans that rest on the assumption that if a deprived child is helped to catch up with his age-mates, he will then be able to progess normally in a traditional curriculum.

However, it must be recognized that as long as a child is subjected to handicapping influences outside the school, the curriculum must take account of those influences and respond constructively to them. It is essential, therefore, that the need for reconstructing their curriculum be viewed as extending from the kindergarten through the high school. Specific innovation aimed at particular problems must be complemented by other approaches that are broadly comprehensive.

School people are beginning the difficult job of searching for new approaches to learning problems. As far as the disadvantaged child is concerned, the Council urges school systems to shed outmoded approaches that are ineffective, and seek new curricula that will allow the student to explore verbally, intellectually, and with his hands, in a secure and pressure-free school environment. We must give him the chance to explore--and we

must let him do it at his own pace.

Teacher Aides.

The Council believes that in many cases teacher aides were added simply because the schools--particularly those in rural areas--were unable to hire qualified professionals. About 50% more teacher aides than regular teachers were added to schools with Title I funds, and one-third of the projects sampled included them. These new helpers in the classroom cannot replace the teacher, but they can and are increasing teacher productivity by assuming a variety of classroom duties, thus enabling the teacher to spend his time more effectively.

However, new ways need to be found to make teacher aides more useful, and to better determine their actual effectiveness in a variety of situations. In the meantime, aides are providing helping hands in thousands of classrooms across the country.

It is the Council's view that properly trained teacher aides should not only perform clerical tasks, but, under supervision, be allowed to do some limited instructional work in the classroom as well. While the Council does not endorse lowering teacher qualification standards, it does feel that those schools which demand a teacher's certificate of all who would assist children to learn, are rejecting a valuable resource. The need for nonprofessional teacher help in the classroom is tremendous--but fortunately the supply of interested persons is also large.

A school in rural North Carolina recently advertised for eight teacher aides. Twenty persons applied--and eighteen had some college training.

Many programs use, as teacher aides, parents of the children in the school. In some cities pre-service training programs help prepare aides, including those recruited from poverty communities, to assume their new duties in the classroom. This involvement of parents and neighbors as aides helps strengthen the relationship between the school, the community, and the home.

Health, Food, and Clothing.

Classroom teachers have long been acutely aware of the limitations imposed by poverty upon teaching and learning. Title I breakfast programs, new health services, and provisions for clothing for disadvantaged children are helping to overcome these basic obstacles to learning. Of projects reviewed, one-half included health services and one-quarter food. About 5% of the projects included provisions for clothing. Because poor health is a major reason why disadvantaged children are not succeeding in school (in one school district, a health examination conducted for the first time under Title I showed that 45% of the children were anemic), the Council recommends increased attention to these services, and urges school leaders to accept the unfamiliar obligations they may entail.

The problems of health, nutrition, and clothing must be solved if the handicapped are to learn. But the Council wants its position clearly understood: Notwithstanding the reluctance of some boards of education to assume the unfamiliar task of feeding and clothing the poor, the solution to these social problems should be funded by Title I in order that impoverished children may respond productively to the school's primary mission of teaching and learning.

The Council strongly urges the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Education to give priority to coordination to Federal efforts to provide health and nutritional services to deprived children. But action must take place at the local level, and local schools must be encouraged to use their strength and initiative in solving these problems.

Counseling.

Many schools are using Title I funds to provide guidance and counseling services at the elementary level for the first time. This increasing emphasis illuminates the gross inadequacies of our present training programs in this field. The Council urges universities to confront this problem with a sense of urgency, taking into consideration that it is not only the full-time counselor who needs to gain insight into the problems of the disadvantaged, but also the classroom teacher as well.

The time is ripe for leaders in elementary education and in guidance to combine their judgments to formulate a clearer definition of the term "elementary school guidance," and to plan new approaches to the training of counselors. We see

counseling in the elementary grades as a vital aspect of the disadvantaged child's school experiences. The counselor, whether a full-time specialist or the classroom teacher, can not only guide and assist the child, but is in an excellent position to help parents realize the importance of the role they play in his education.

It is particularly important that disadvantaged children with outstanding potential be identified and given special opportunities to develop their abilities.

Libraries.

The fact that 20% of the sample projects set aside funds for library programs, indicates a marked deficiency of librarians and materials in those elementary and secondary schools serving disadvantaged children. Libraries are included in most new elementary school construction, but many older schools, especially those in deprived neighborhoods, have no library and often lack sufficient reading materials.

While some Title I money is being used in support of libraries, Title II of the Act is the primary resource for increasing library services in elementary and secondary schools.

It is encouraging to note that in most States the bulk of Title II funds is being spent for libraries, but we recognize this as only a beginning. Many school systems are forced to use both Title I funds and those available under Title I to purchase books. The

Council urges that in disbursement of Title II library funds, maximum attention be given to the schools serving deprived neighborhoods, and the unique needs and circumstances of disadvantaged children be taken into special account in the selection of materials.

The Council is pleased to see some school systems developing after-school and summer programs using their new library as the focal point, and would like to emphasize the fact that such well-equipped facilities can provide disadvantaged children with a quiet place to study, reference materials, and tutorial help--three major contributors to successful educational experiences that are all too often not available in the deprived home.

Equipment.

More than one in five of the projects studied included the purchase of educational equipment and materials. Some private firms in the educational field responded to Title I by putting new products and salesmen in the field. This has resulted in groups of remarkably similar projects which contain standard phraseology and devote disproportionate amounts of money to equipment and materials. States must carefully evaluate equipment and materials purchased to make sure they respond primarily to the educational needs of educationally deprived children. On the other hand, States should not hesitate to approve the purchase of equipment and materials if trained personnel are available to use them, and if their use will result in substantial benefits.

IV PROBLEM AREAS

Introduction.

With the Act in force less than a year, there are already in evidence certain problems and potential problems which threaten to prevent the achievement of its objectives. The Council is particularly concerned about areas where poverty is widespread, where the resources available to support the schools are small, and where the ability to hire outstanding educators and staff is low. It is our belief that the major problems in the administration of the Act arise because inadequate leadership seems concentrated in the very areas where the need for imagination and reform is the greatest.

Reaching the Children.

The Council is most concerned that the benefits of Title I may not be reaching the children who need them most. We refer to four specific problems:

First, there is a great need for school administrators to construct creative programs in areas where migrant children are now being neglected. New and imaginative services under Title I should be developed for these 150,000 youngsters.

Second, the Council believes that a means test is not the soundest way to determine the educational needs of the child who needs help. Although initial allocations of Title I money are based on economic deprivation, educators must continually seek ways to focus aid on the children who are most deprived educationally.

Third, while it is desirable that the programs developed under Title I be compatible with similar activities sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the relationship between local boards of education and community action programs should not be so structured by Federal guidelines as to give CAP controlling authority over public education. This relationship has, in some cities, handicapped or delayed program initiative by local schools and given excessive authority to CAP agencies.

And finally, the Council is concerned that administrative laxity in enforcing compulsory school attendance laws may interfere considerably with the ability of Title I programs to reach disadvantaged children.

Lack of Personnel.

In virtually every area studied, there is an alarming lack of personnel, particularly in specialized skills.

The problems of disadvantaged children are many-sided--and educators must have trained allies to help with their task. Not only are more experienced classroom teachers and administrators urgently needed, but psychologists and social workers, remedial instructors, nurses, guidance counselors, speech and hearing personnel, reading specialists, etc., must be found or trained and put to work.

In State after State, the problem is the same: "We can't get the trained people we need to carry out Title I programs." And yet without them, the Act cannot succeed.

Appropriate in-service training courses are available under Titles I and V, and several other Federal laws. But it is clear

that dramatic increases in funds and training efforts are needed to meet the growing demands for specialists skilled in solving the educational problems of the poor.

Quality Control.

Under the law, local educational agencies spend Federal funds after State approval. The Congress and the American people expect Title I money to be spent wisely, but it is difficult centrally to insure uniform quality through the existing Federal-State-local relationship. Most States responded well to Federal advice and assistance, and have taken positive action to remedy short-comings. But in at least two respects, we note the intended spirit of the Act in removing Federal control.

First, the Office of Education, aware of the importance of respecting local autonomy and leaving the final approval decisions to the State, has found no way, except through exhortation, to revise projects of low quality which the State and local district claim are directed to the most pressing needs of disadvantaged children. Several communities have programs which consist solely of audio visual projectors and films. Others have such weak programs that any success is doubtful. The Act was intended to encourage the initiative of State and local educators, including Boards of Education; and in respect for that intent, the Office of Education has invoked its responsibility to supervise Title I primarily by requiring only that objective criteria be observed.

Second, in our judgment, significant progress with the disadvantaged depends on the investment of a substantial amount of money per pupil, and a program which concentrates a variety

of services on a limited number of children. In some cases, school administrators have succumbed to local pressure to spread the limited amount of money over as many children as possible. It is apparent the Office of Education guidelines urging concentration of funds have been disregarded in several States, possibly because these documents were unnecessarily liberal in their insurance of local autonomy.

There are several other factors which have adversely affected the quality of projects:

(1) In many instances, States do not have enough competent central staff members to implement the billion-dollar Title I program, and as a result they have not been able to render the amount of assistance needed by local educational agencies.

(2) Often, State education agencies do not have the political support to challenge questionable Title I proposals of large cities.

(3) The Office of Education was not equipped in September to launch this program. It still has no field staff, and yet is attempting the massive job of keeping the States informed, as well as collecting Title I information for evaluation purposes.

Relationship Between Public Schools and Private and Parochial Schools.

While it was anticipated that this would be a sensitive feature of the new legislation, there have been remarkably few official

complaints concerning its implementation.

The Council wishes to emphasize the need for most careful attention to the administration of the Act in order to protect against violation of our constitutional safeguards, and to insure that needy children in private and parochial schools will receive all the services to which they are now entitled by law.

There are, however, some early indications that the disadvantaged children in private and parochial schools are receiving less help than Title I intended for them. While private and parochial school children live in 256 of the project areas studied, they are fully participating in Title I projects in only 180 of them. Many localities seem to involve private school pupils in the periphery of a project, or at a time and place this is inconvenient. Unfortunately, many of the projects reviewed by the Council were either vague or silent about the participation of disadvantaged children from non-public schools.

We, therefore, recommend that the Office of Education require, on all Title I applications, a clear statement of the extent to which each project will involve children from private and parochial schools. It is the Council's feeling that the program will continue to be effective only as long as it is administered to reach all needy children wherever they are found.

We are gratified to learn that in many communities this legislation has sparked the first meaningful discussions

between school officials of the local public school system and private schools. This is an important side benefit of the Act.

Coordination of Title I with the Federal Anti-Poverty Program. The Council believes there is urgent need for the Commissioner of Education and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to agree on the types of programs each agency will sponsor, and to publicize the terms of that agreement so that current uncertainty and confusion on the part of local school people and the general public can be eliminated. Even though respective agency responsibilities should be stated concretely, the Council believes that some flexibility should be maintained so that local educational agencies can imaginatively use the resources of both without unnecessary duplication of effort.

The Title I Guidelines of the Office of Education state that there should be "continuous and genuine working relationships [between the local school system and the community action agency] during the period when programs are planned and developed, as well as when they are being carried out." The Council wishes to re-emphasize the importance of that statement insuring, however, that legal authority and responsibility vested in local boards of education are preserved.

The Council notes that there are communities where community action funds and Title I funds are being imaginatively combined, and feels that more such cooperative efforts could be implemented if communities had a greater awareness of the respective responsibilities of the two agencies.

The Poorest Counties.

A major problem that existed in January--reduced now to the point where it warrants only a mention by the Council--was the situation among the 181 poverty-stricken counties in the United States where the per capita annual income is less than $750. On January 1, 1966, about 80 percent of these school systems had received no funds whatever under Title I, but by March 1 the figure had been reduced to 27 percent.7/

The Council wishes to commend the U.S. Office of Education and especially the States and local school systems, for accomplishing this remarkable progress in two short months. This example of Federal-State-local cooperation resulted in help for the children needing it most, and avoided a major setback in the program.

Federal Control.

It appears to the Council that the Office of Education has made an earnest effort to minimize Federal control over Title I. The instructions issued by the Office clearly leave control over local projects to local and State authorities.

The Office of Education also has been criticized strongly for lengthy and detailed Title I application forms. The Office has

7/ It should be noted that an additional 11 percent, including 18 counties and school districts within three addtional counties, were ineligible to receive $7.7 million allocated to them because their school administrators refused to sign a statement of compliance with civil rights regulations.

been sympathetic to these criticisms and is attempting to simplify the application forms for next year's program. However, they do not intend to compromise the States' need to get accurate and detailed information from the local school districts, to make proper analyses of the projects, and be assured they are effective.

Despite problems and administrative setbacks, there is little question that officials and educators at every level--Federal, State, and local--have responded quickly and remarkably well in launching this massive new Title I program in the short time available this year.

V. EVALUATION

The variety of conditions in which disadvantaged children are found, and the lack of much tested experience in dealing effectively with the educational problems involved, make it necessary to appraise carefully the many new efforts that are being initiated under this Act in order to determine which of them are most effective. The importance of this evaluation is recognized in the legislation. Title I emphasizes and contains special provisions for the evaluation of the extent to which projects and programs conducted under it are effective in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and for periodic reports on the results of this evaluation. Each project proposal includes a statement of plans for its appraisal.

It is too early to obtain evidence about the results of any of the programs, but it is abundantly clear that the evaluation will be difficult. In the first place, few school districts have base-line data regarding the previous educational achievements of disadvantaged children. Hence, the extent of improvement with the new program cannot readily be measured. In the second place, the commonly used tests in the several school subjects are constructed primarily to appraise the levels of achievement of the average children in each grade and they do not provide a dependable measure of attainments of the more disadvantaged. This means that there are no

instruments presently available that are adequate to furnish objective indices of the improvements in their educational achievements. Furthermore, few school districts have qualified personnel for developing satisfactory evaluation procedures.

There are prospects for remedying some of these deficiencies. The Office of Education is providing manuals to help local districts in planning their appraisals. A number of the State Departments of Education are adding staff members to assist local schools on these problems. Through support provided by Carnegie Corporation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education is constructing evaluation instruments, some of which will be useful in furnishing objective evidence of the extent of educational progress taking place among disadvantaged children.

In the meantime, a small number of projects will be obtaining some objective data on the results. Use will also be made of trained observers employed to study a representative sample of projects to obtain informed, subjective judgments of the results that are observed. Careful review will also be made of another sample of projects to appraise them in terms of the extent to which the plans and procedures are based on a study of the local problems, and intelligent use of resources to attack these problems. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will fund several university based research teams to measure the effectiveness of Title I programs, with special emphasis on

cost-effectiveness analyses. In the next annual report, the Council expects to have some relevant, partly-objective information on the results being attained by a sample of the projects.

Because of the importance of evaluation and its difficulty, a major effort will need to be made to develop instruments and procedures, and to get wide adoption of sound and helpful programs of appraisal.

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the Federal Government continue to provide massive educational assistance, focused on the special problems of the disadvantaged children of our country. Merely to provide general aid for schools will not necessarily guarantee that the special problems of the disadvantaged will receive the attention they require.

2. Classroom teachers have recognized their own lack of understanding and skills necessary for the effective teaching of the disadvantaged. Because this understanding and training are prerequisites to the implementation of Title I programs, we recommend that increased Title I funds be made available for training classroom teachers and the specialists who assist them in their work with the disadvantaged.

3. The Council also urges colleges and universities throughout the country to act with some urgency in placing qualified personnel on their staff to implement special classes for teachers of the disadvantaged. We recommend that funds be made available to these institutions to allow further research into the problems of the disadvantaged, and to aid them in carrying out the additional responsibilities which Title I has created.

4. There is no doubt that implementation of Title I was greatly hampered this year by the non-availability of funds until

after the school year began. Most personnel in needed specialties were already under contract, and school administrators were forced to plan projects almost overnight. The pressures of time gave State Departments of Education little opportunity to revise substantially many quickly-conceived programs. We strongly urge the Congress to enact the next Title I appropriations bill as early as possible, but not later than early summer 1966, to permit more careful program development and thus assure more effective use of the funds.

5. The success of the Act will continue to depend upon initiative of local and State educational authorities. The Council recommends that the Commissioner of Education, using his authority under Section 205a of the Act, establish more helpful criteria so that States will receive for approval local projects that focus maximum effort on the disadvantaged, and thus assure higher levels of quality control without intruding upon local Board of Education authority.

6. We recommend that present Office of Education Guidelines be liberalized to allow school districts to use Title I funds for construction of facilities necessary to implement programs for the education of the disadvantaged.

7. The Council's observations have led them to conclude that the Office of Education is understaffed to accomplish the ends contemplated by this Act. We recommend that addtional staff

be made available, particularly for field work and to assist the States and localities in carrying out the intent of this legislation.

8. The Council recommends that added emphasis be placed on the education of pre-school children, ages three to five years, since research indicates that disadvantaged children enter school depressed in language skills and lacking in those experiences which are important to later school success.

9. Although the short planning period available to school administrators for this year's projects made it difficult for them to consult teachers, the Council urges that teachers and interested citizens participate in Title I project planning next year. Office of Education Guidelines should be revised to encourage this procedure.

10. The provision of educational opportunities for disadvantaged children during after-school hours, on Saturdays, and in the summer, offer promise of improving their education. However, when teachers are assigned to these programs and receive no compensation for the additional time involved, their morale is substantially reduced. Hence, the Council recommends that these programs be staffed by teachers who voluntarily offer their services and that appropriate compnesation be provided for the additional time involved.

VII CONCLUSION

As noted throughout this report, the conditions which handicap children in their education are of many kinds. Some are physical, such as inadequate nutrition, limited energy, bodily injuries, and the residual effects of illness. Some are home conditions, such as the loss of a parent, lack of home guidance and assistance, no place or time for home study, and lack of exposure to the English language. Some are the inadequacies of the community or neighborhood, such as indifference to learning, no aspirations for development, lack of examples of people who have high ideals and live constructive lives, and dearth of institutions and facilities that stimulate and encourage development. In some cases, the schools themselves are inadequate to stimulate children to learn and to encourage, guide, and help him in their education. Unfortunately, many children are subject to more than one of these limiting conditions, so that they are seriously hampered in obtaining real educational opportunity.

Growing out of these severe difficulties, disadvantaged children exhibit many kinds of handicaps. For example, some are unable to muster the physical energy that schooling requires. Some have had so many painful experiences in their contacts with the world that they are afraid of school, while others react by antagonism. Some are apathetic, making no effort to learn. Some have not developed sensory perception sufficient to distinguish the differences in sounds required to hear words, or the differences

in appearance required to recognize different letters. Some come to school without the oral language background required to begin primary reading. Many lack the habits normally expected of school children, such as punctuality, undistracted work efforts, and responsibility. Some have no aspiration to learn. Some lack confidence that they can learn and are unwilling to make the effort. Most disadvantaged children have more than one physical, social, intellectual, or emotional handicap.

Fortunately, in many areas there are helpful resources that can be brought to bear in providing educational opportunity for disadvantaged children. Even among the most poverty striken there are some families that are able to exert a constructive influence on the children. In many communities there are agencies that can provide help in fields like health, recreation, and youth development. Some of the communities are constructive in their general influence and include imaginative and dedicated persons who are able to assist in a positive program. Some schools have long recognized the needs of disadvantaged children in their districts and have worked out effective means for attacking their local problems. Some of the most seriously handicapped children are in areas where the available resources are very limited but in many places resources can be found that can make a significant contribution.

This law provides financial support for a concerted effort to provide real educational opportunity to disadvantaged children.

However, because the patterns of inadequacies and the corresponding handicaps from which the children suffer are varied, and because the resources that can be mobilized differ from community to community, no single kind of program can suffice to provide the greatly needed extension of educational opportunity and the improvement in quality of the education of disadvantaged children. What is necessary is for each community to study its own problems and resources on the basis of which it can devise programs that are likely to attack at the roots the problems found there, utilizing the resources that can be brought to bear there.

Ultimately, it is probable that there will emerge a small number of common patterns of disadvantagement and some general procedures and programs that are shown to be effective in dealing with a particular kind of problem. To develop these, to test them out, and obtain wide adoption of successful plans will take imagination, energy, and dedication from school people as well as requiring substantial investments of money and time. We are now at the beginning of a long and important task.